

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 9 and 12 are amended and claims 3-5, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 14-16 are cancelled. No new matter is added. Support for amended claims 1, 6, 9 and 12 can be found at least at Fig. 8 and page 17, lines 15-33, of the specification. In view of at least the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and timely allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,819,311 B2 to Nose et al. (hereinafter Nose).

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that Nose fails to disclose the driving method for an electro-optical apparatus as recited. Claim 1 recites a driving method comprising, *inter alia*, "selecting, during a first sub field of each frame, a scanning line of the plurality of scanning lines and applying the data signal to a pixel corresponding to the scanning line, and applying, during a first portion of a second sub field that follows the first sub field, a non-data signal that has a same polarity as the data signal applied to the pixel and of a maximum voltage value to a signal line corresponding to the pixel and selecting, during a second portion that follows the first portion of the second sub field, a scanning line and applying the non-data signal to the pixel." However, Nose is found to merely disclose a driving process for a liquid crystal display comprising two scanning line selection periods within one field, namely an image data selection period t1 for writing a gradation voltage corresponding with the image data to the pixel electrode, and a black display section period t2 for writing a voltage corresponding with a black display to the pixel electrode (col. 8, lines 17-24.) Nose is not found to disclose a driving method for an electro-optical apparatus as positively recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Nose cannot reasonably be considered to disclose the combination of all the features positively recited in independent claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 9, Applicant asserts that Nose fails to disclose an electro-optical apparatus, comprising, *inter alia*, "a control circuit that controls the scanning line driving circuit and the signal line driving circuit, selects, during a first sub field of each frame, a scanning line of the plurality of scanning lines and applies the data signal to a pixel corresponding to the scanning line, and applies, during a first portion of a second sub field that follows the first sub field, a non-data signal that has a same polarity as the data signal applied to the pixel and of a maximum voltage value to a signal line corresponding to the pixel and selects, during a second portion that follows the first portion of the second sub field, a scanning line and applies the non-data signal to the pixel." Nose is found to merely disclose a driving process for a liquid crystal display comprising two scanning line selection periods within one field, namely an image data selection period t1 for writing a gradation voltage corresponding with the image data to the pixel electrode, and a black display section period t2 for writing a voltage corresponding with a black display to the pixel electrode (col. 8, lines 17-24.) Nose is not found to disclose a driving method for an electro-optical apparatus as positively recited in claim 9.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Nose cannot reasonably be considered to disclose the combination of all the features positively recited in independent claim 9.

Based on the foregoing remarks in relation to independent claims 1 and 9, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

Dependent claims 2, 6, 12 and 13 are patentable for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable as discussed above, as well as for the additional

features they recite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

II. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nose in view of US Patent No. 6,784,836 B2 to Yanagi et al. (hereinafter "Yanagi").


Claims 10 and 14-16 have been cancelled, therefore obviating the rejection. Further, Yanagi was simply introduced for an asserted teaching of a two-terminal switching element (Office Action, p. 9). Therefore, Yanagi, either alone or in combination with Nose, cannot reasonably be considered to disclose all the features positively recited in independent claims 1 and 9.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:GCV/jgg

Date: August 2, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
